

CANDOUR

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance
Vol. XXXV No. 7 and 8 Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper July/August, 1984.

The British Views-Letter

THE ABSTAINERS WIN THE DAY

Once again, patriots may express delight at the success of the national abstention tactic devised by Mr. Anthony Cooney's *Liverpool Newsletter* and subsequently taken up by the various anti-Common Market organisations. As election officials counted the ballot papers in the vote for the so-called European elections held on June 14th, it became rapidly clear that for the second time Britain was left firmly at the bottom of the E.E.C. voting league table. Official turn-out figures showed that only about thirty per cent of the electorate had participated. Such a derisory vote underlined the fact that the European Assemblymen represent nobody except themselves and their party apparatus. We should treat their claim to validate the dictates of the Brussels bureaucrats with hilarity and disdain.

The attempt by the pro-Common Market press to rationalise the mass abstention of the electorate as "apathy" is preposterous. It was the expression of a deep and conscious *antipathy* which could not be overcome even by incessant publicity on the television and in the newspapers and by an extensive advertisement campaign funded by the E.E.C. to the tune of millions of pounds of the voters' own taxes. The mass abstention was a splendid re-affirmation of British nationhood and a re-awakening of national awareness, for it demonstrated that the consent on which the party politicians claim our continued membership of the E.E.C. rests does not exist. When will Parliament bow to the democratic decision of the British people and repeal the seditious legislation which binds us to the Common Market?

Unfortunately, as Mr. Roger Scruton observed in his *Times* column during the great "Euro-yawn", the British public's contempt for the European Parliament is not shared by the opinionated classes. "Always active, always vociferous, always in search of an opportunity to try out their hare-brained schemes for human improvement, nothing seems to them more likely to bring lasting benefits to mankind than a parliament composed of people entirely like themselves." It is a parliament, he said, of "social democrats, euro-communists, and hysterical radicals, moulded by cranky republican theories." Presumably his own affiliation to the Conservative Party prevented Mr. Scruton including in this list the so-called European Conservatives who, in abject denial

of their name are disposed neither to maintain existing institutions nor promote individual enterprise.

Menace Of European Union

Their lack of loyalty was manifest in the Assembly's vote on February 14th of this year when the M.E.P.s came down in favour of an entirely new and revolutionary Treaty of European Union, which they want all member states to sign. *Only four Conservative Members voted against the proposal.* The Treaty envisages setting up a new political entity — the "Union of Europe" — with autonomous powers to achieve monetary, economic, political and fiscal union. It will be a sovereign body, entitled to re-distribute the resources and the reserves of the member states, in obedience to the dictates of the Commission and its President. Once the Union is established, member states will lose sovereignty in almost every matter from social welfare to taxation. The European Union laws will take precedence over national laws, and it will take positive initiatives to break down national barriers.

The menace of measures of such a profoundly political kind is unmistakable. While it would be perfectly possible to resign from the United Nations and to contract out of NATO or GATT, the proposed European Union would be quite a different thing, being the foundation of a federal structure. The nations forming a federation are, as it were, built in: the federal authority over a given field is the legal authority. Alliances by their very nature in a world of flux are temporary arrangements and involve no *irrevocable* surrender of national sovereignty. But to agitate against a federal constitution in some circumstances can be to violate the law which the federation imposes on the land. The Southern United States, even after a fratricidal war, was unable to contract out of the American Union.

The Euro-election was a potential death-trap for Britain, and in voting for its second-rate candidates in derisory numbers, the British response was a clear rejection of the Euro-parliament's illusion of legitimacy. Yet we must still work to GET BRITAIN OUT to regain our right to self-government as a sovereign nation and protect ourselves against the imposition of a unitary, supranational Euro-state.

GIVING THE SECOND HALF TO CHINA

by DON BELL

The communications media were ecstatic. President Reagan and his entourage flew into Red China, performed exactly as directed, the President signed or initialled all the previously prepared treaties, accords, agreements and declarations. All was sweetness and light, promises of peace and friendship, on the surface at least. Given the chance to speak to the masses, President Reagan talked by taped speech. But what the Chinese actually heard was questionable. What he said was not interpreted, but was interpolated or censored. What he said of faith and freedom, of trust in God: all this was deleted from the tape and nobody heard him talk of "our passion for freedom". To say such things in a slave state would have been quite a gaffe. But the producers of the show were alert, and if no one heard what he said, what Chinese can ask, "Did he really say it?"

At about the time that Ronald Reagan was beginning his third year in office, the Trilateralists began demanding that aid to Taiwan be cut off, and that friendship with Communist China be developed. Here was a virtually unexplored land mass that was just waiting for the Megabankers to invest and the Multinational Corporations to develop for their own gain. At that time, under public protest but unwilling agreement by the President, it was decided that the United States should arm Communist China because, so the argument went, if there was ever any trouble with Red Russia, Red China would be an important ally. At that time, Rep. LeBoutillier, a New York Republican, asked the exiled Russian writer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, whether the United States was repeating the same mistake it had made when it cozied up to the Soviet Union. Asked the former Congressman, "Do you see China, and our moves in the last ten years towards opening relations with Red China, as a mistake on the same level as what Roosevelt did with Stalin?"

Solzhenitsyn responded: "Yes. At the same level . . . China is now comparable to the Soviet Union in the 'thirties. It needs American know-how, American help . . . But if you arm China, you will give China the second half of the earth, the very half where America is situated, and there nothing will help you . . . You know even less about China than about the Soviet Union, and therefore this myth of a good Communist, of good Communism in China. In thirty or forty years, you will read the Chinese *Gulag Archipeligo*, and you will be stunned, and you will say, well, we didn't know; but you must know, you must find out, you must know what's going on. It might be fraught with con-

sequences, jeopardizing the very existence of the United States of America . . . When the Chinese government states that it allegedly is concerned over the development of their people — no Communist government ever takes care of the development of its people. The Communist governments are like a cancer growth. They grow senselessly, only for two reasons. First of all, to strengthen their power, and as soon as they have done so, to expand it, and to occupy other parts. This has always been the goal of the Soviet government. Such a goal is inherent in the Chinese government. By trusting China you will yield the other half of the earth, because the main threat is now of the present administration's trust in China. This is impossible. They are the same Communists, they use the same methods, and they use the same annihilation policy."

Economic Struggle

With a general increase in the knowledge of how Debt Capitalism has nourished International Communism until it has become a world power, there also has been the beginning of understanding that this is an economic struggle in which we are engaged. Despite wars and rumours of wars, the industrial growth of the Multinationals has continued. Mainland China is yet to be developed. So Armand Hammer steps in to take over for the Communists what Herbert Hoover once began to develop under the name of the Kailan Mining Administration; coal mines are still to be expropriated and expanded. Into China rushes other corporations, through the open door policies first unlocked by Kissinger and Nixon, and now being thrown open by Shultz and Reagan at the behest of the Trilateral Commission. In the greater sense, this is not political battling or physical warring, but economic promotion. Use of slave labour means greater profits. On site construction it saves transportation costs and reduces taxes. National restrictions can be avoided, and so on.

But behind all this diplomatic, political, belligerent activity, there is the spiritual battle, which is so often overlooked. It is important to understand that although Communism professes atheism as its religion, there has had to be a certain compromise. The Bolsheviks found that even after murdering millions of Christians, they still had at least to pretend to permit Christian worship within their Soviet Socialist States. When a new constitution was written it contained an article which seemed to permit Christian worship. Under K.G.B. supervision, a few churches were permitted to exist. A ranking officer of the K.G.B. became a member of the board of the

World Council of Churches. Some Christian evangelists, notably Billy Graham, were allowed to conduct services in the U.S.S.R. The Catholic Church in Poland was permitted to continue its services. It seemed to the Communist leaders and their superiors that a semblance of compromise must be allowed.

We find the same situation in Red China. Although the first years under the dictatorship of Mao Tse-Tung witnessed the murder of millions of priests and Chinese Christians, when the new "open door" policy began to develop, the Chinese hierarchy found that it also had to *pretend* to permit Christian worship within its atheist country. So, as had happened in the Soviet Union, the Fifth National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China in 1978 adopted a new constitution. In it was an article which *seemed* to permit the worship of Christianity. That constitution states: "Citizens enjoy freedom to believe in religion and freedom not to believe in religion and to propagate atheism." Dr. Fred Schwarz of the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade immediately observed that "the precise wording is significant: religion may be *believed*, whereas atheism may be *propagated*." In an excellent commentary comparing the Chinese and Soviet actions, he wrote:

"The [new Chinese] constitution grants no freedom to evangelize even though it is an essential element of the Christian faith. Christians are not free to attempt to win others to Christ . . . The Chinese Communists have not yet granted the minimal freedom proclaimed in this constitution, but the Soviet Union has had a similar clause, 'Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda', in their constitution for many years. It has been applied as follows: 1) Every child is taught atheism systematically in school. 2) Worship services for established believers are permitted under supervision and control. 3) Church schools are prohibited. 4) Youth groups are prohibited. 5) Evangelistic services and campaigns are prohibited. 6) Hospitals and charitable organisations are prohibited. 7) It is a criminal offence to persuade a child to believe in Christ. This is a caricature of true freedom of religion. Those individuals and churches who desire to be true to Christ are compelled to operate unofficially. As a consequence, many of the Christian leaders are condemned to prison or to the living death of a psychiatric institute. The Communists believe there is no God and that religion is the opiate of the masses. Their ultimate objective is to destroy religion. However, their immediate objective is to use it scientifically to aid their programme of world conquest. They believe a religion can be used as a tool to disarm those chosen for conquest and enslavement. They seek to mesmerize religious leaders

of western nations by showing visitors packed worship services to gladden their hearts and to cause them to overlook the strenuous efforts to convert all children to atheism. It is amazing that Christians can observe the spiritual infanticide that is so characteristic of Communism with complacency. It shows scorn for the Christ who said that it was better to die than to cause one child to stumble. It is tragic that many church leaders can be drugged with a few crumbs of freedom so that they are indifferent and inactive while the destruction of the faith of the younger generation proceeds."

Arrest, Torture And Death

Regardless of the words in Communist constitutions, persecutions continue. In the U.S.S.R. Christians obeying God instead of the K.G.B. are "treated" in psychological institutions or are committed to slow death in some concentration camp. In Red China, Christians refusing to join the "Three-Self Patriotic Movement", which is a government-controlled church established for propaganda purposes, are accused of using "feudalistic superstitions to incite anti-government activities." This is a criminal offence worthy of torture, even death. According to the Rev. Jeffrey A. Collins, executive director of Christian Response International, more than 300 practising Christians have been arrested in China's current "purification campaign". There is a Communist controlled "Three-Self Patriotic Movement" for Protestants and a "Catholic Patriotic Church" for Catholics, established to consolidate all denominations and place all Christians under the control of the appropriate government agency, while discouraging the distribution of Bibles or Christian literature from outside China. Nevertheless, under K.G.B. supervision, Billy Graham plans another crusade in the U.S.S.R. next year, and Pat Boone is organizing a "Mission to China" in accordance with the rules laid down by the respective Chinese Communist agency. Also, the leader of the "Three-Self Patriotic Movement" is planning a campaign in Australia this fall, in an attempt to convince the faithful down under that Communism and Christianity are compatible.

In their development of their New World Order, the builders have relied upon the use of Marxist-Hegelian dialectics in all of their works, including religion. This involves bringing about a conflict between — or a merging of — two opposites in order to create something new. Webster's Dictionary explains it as "development through the stages of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis in accordance with the laws of dialectical materialism." For example, the builders of the New World Order accepted Capitalism as their thesis, developed Communism as their

antithesis, and through created conflicts between and attempted mergings of the two they intend to bring about their synthesis, which is a Socialist One World Government. Nor have they neglected the use of religion. Looking upon Christianity as the thesis, they took atheism as the antithesis, and they hope to bring about a new one world religion which will be similar to the Secular Humanism now being taught in government schools throughout the United States. Hence, through conflict (murder of Christians in the U.S.S.R. and P.R.C.) and the attempts at merging (making Christianity and atheism compatible through the preaching of Humanism), they hope to create a world religion to accompany their world government, world currency. New International Economic Order, etc. "And this is that spirit of Anti-Christ, whereof you have heard that it should come; and even now it is in the world."

Exclusively available to subscribers

PORTRAIT REPRODUCTION OF A. K. CHESTERTON

Price: 50p.

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY
FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HANTS.

A EURO-VOTE IS TREASON

In an interview with the *East Hampshire Post* on June 6th, *Candour's* Editor urged East Hants people not to vote in the forthcoming European elections.

Speaking in her capacity as campaign director of the local Committee of Catholics and Anglicans Against the Common Market, Miss de Bouneville was reported as saying: "I cannot believe that people are so uninformed that they will give up the sovereignty of England.

"It is treason to support the Euro-parliament. We are giving our powers of autonomous government and law to Europe — we will have no control any more. The treaty of the European Union is the international bankers' plot to destroy our nation and monarchy."

Miss de Bourneville said she hoped to deter people from voting by dropping leaflets through doors and was considering campaigning outside polling stations.

"To take part in the elections for the so-called European Parliament is — under the terms of the Bill of Rights of 1689 — a seditious act against the Queen's Sovereignty in the United Kingdom. According to the Union Treaty, the European Council will appoint a President and this man will have the powers of a dictator."

CUT AND THRUST

The run on America's fourth largest bank, Manufacturers Hanover Trust, at the end of May, almost developed into the sort of panic that even the Federal Reserve Board could not stop. It reflected the extent to which the big banks have been seriously weakened by the burden of unrepayable loans to the Third World. These banks face a grim future in that there is no prospect of the total of outstanding loans diminishing. The so-called have-not nations have borrowed so much in recent years that the interest bill is rising faster than the payments of interest, despite most of their available funds going for the repayment of old loans, which accounts for the very real fears expressed at the London economic summit last month that the debtors' house of cards might finally collapse. The intrinsic absurdity of the situation (as indeed of the entire international financial system) is so clear that it would make an impact on most minds were it not for the fiction, sedulously fostered through the years, that high finance is one of the mysteries not understandable by the average human intelligence.

So great is the dilemma for the banks that we do not often hear now of the pressure exerted in the 'seventies for the treasuries of the "have-nots" to accept new loans so as to secure repayment of the old loans. Instead, the massive bill for the world debt crisis appears to be on its way to the Western taxpayers. In Britain, for instance, we could be faced with an annual burden of between £250 million and £500 million. This direct weight of debt for the British taxpayer arises mainly through the activities of the Export Credits Guarantee Department, the Government agency which provides insurance cover for British companies selling abroad and also guarantees long term loans made by British banks to foreign buyers of British goods. The E.C.G.D. is coy about disclosing its exposure to individual countries, but it seems likely that the Latin American countries could cost us at least £2 billion over the next few years. Is this the reason that Mr. Lawson, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, despite appearances to the contrary, caused the overall burden of taxation to increase in his 1984 Budget, as did his

predecessor Sir Geoffrey Howe in every Budget since 1979? Indeed, it is a wonderful racket. The international bankers simply cannot lose.

* * * *

All the evidence suggests that through the years the Home Office has deliberately played down the magnitude of the immigrant influx. So there is good cause to believe that its latest batch of statistics, which are being used to suggest that the number of immigrants is falling, very likely err on the side of caution. As with inflation, the figures actually mean the rate of increase is less, and a pretty marginal "fall" it is, too. In 1983 there was a total of 53,460 new "acceptances for settlement", which is only 410 fewer than in 1982! The really worrying trend is in the numbers of non-white children born here of New Commonwealth and Pakistani origin. If Bradford be taken as a reliable yardstick, the immigration policy of the last thirty years has made very heavy inroads upon our population. The local council published in March a booklet of statistics showing that while the white population is expected to shrink by almost 17,000 over the next twelve years, the "N.C.P." number will increase by almost 30,000 and constitute a good quarter of the population. Again, what are the odds that these figures are modest estimates? It is no use simply asking what the politicians have done with our beloved country. We must work to ensure that the iniquitous policy of mass immigration is thrown into a substantial reverse.

* * * *

Whatever one's views of the rights and wrongs of the coal strike — and there is certainly justice in the argument that it is not in the national interest to decimate the industry to the extent that we become dependent on subsidised foreign suppliers for such a vital commodity — the thoroughly rotten behaviour of some striking miners does nothing to enhance their cause. It was not the N.C.B. employers or Government ministers but their own workmates who were the victims of miners' rottenness in Doncaster on June 26th, when a thousand men descended on the Coal Board's regional office and, like a pack of football hooligans, accosted employees in the streets. The incident was well organised and was one of the worst and most violent outrages perpetrated by Yorkshire "pickets" since the dispute began. Numerous white-collar staff trying to get to work were punched, pushed and jostled or had stones thrown at them, nineteen of the injured being office girls. Windows were smashed and cars were vandalised as gangs of Comrade Scargill's pot-bellied slobbers swaggered the streets and waylaid workers on their way to the N.C.B. office. Ironically, many of

their victims are not only colleagues but relatives of miners.

Such foul behaviour is indicative of a peculiarly unpleasant development in modern industrial disputes. It is a form of spitefulness that marks the deterioration of the British character. Decent trade unionists, and there are many, should be sickened that British workers can be persuaded to undertake this ghastly form of victimisation. No wonder many people feel that the unions, though they originated because of a real need to protect workmen against rapacious employers, are rapidly degenerating into a protection racket. The Government should take action to protect innocent, law-abiding citizens trying to go about their daily business, not least by persuading the police to draw their truncheons more often!

* * * *

Hegel might have thought Africa "the land where men are children", but such a weighty pronouncement has cut no ice with Basil Davidson in his eight-part Channel Four series entitled *Africa*. The thrust of his argument was evident from episode one and he claimed to have made a life-time study of his subject, viz. that the notion of a continent without civilisation before the whites is attributable solely to our association of guilt about the slave trade. Indeed, he has been most concerned to demonstrate the fallacy of our belief that the level of African society has never been more than rudimentary. Did not the Egyptian civilisation, that high point of antiquity, arise out of the so-called Dark Continent? To suppose otherwise, Davidson argued, is to display evidence of that modern sickness of the white consciousness, racism.

Such intellectual tomfoolery in depicting the African as the trail-blazer of civilisation reminds one of the occasions that the African himself has taken a hand in the game of re-writing the history of his continent. One of Hastings Banda's chief lieutenants, for instance, made claims no less ludicrous than Mr. Davidson's. To Kanyama Chiume, it was nonsense to suggest that whites brought civilisation to Africa. "Africans," he declared at the time of Nyasaland's independence, "were civilised while the Europeans were still in caves. The wheel was invented in Timbuktoo. The spoon first stirred in the Sudan and the pyramids were the first evidence of African civilisation." Master Chiume was not, as one might suppose, a professional comic in his native Nyasaland, but the territory's Education Minister!

* * * *

The claims made by Messrs. Chiume and Davidson would find much favour with the "anti-racists" who

have wormed their way into the education service, their principal concern being to see that English life and culture are replaced in the classroom with "multi-cultural studies". One lone voice spoke out against this disturbing trend at the annual conference in Brighton of the National Association of Head Teachers. Mr. Angus Macmillan, a headmaster from Birmingham, called on his colleagues to deplore the current drive to introduce "multi-cultural" education everywhere. It was dilettante, he said, for in the field, say, of religious studies, it suggests that dabbling in a fragmentary knowledge of a number of religions is adequate. Pupils, Mr. Macmillan argued, should not be made to neglect "our fine existing traditions." However, his voice of protest was ignored by delegates.

Our children are not to escape the conditioning of their minds by the race fanatics wherever they live. Another recent programme on Channel Four lambasted some education authorities for not seeing "multi-cultural studies" (by which they always mean Negro or Asian studies — *never* Irish or Polish or Greek) as relevant where white people are in a majority. "We cannot", said one contributor to the *Black on Black* programme, "be telling children in Devon that the only people that matter are white children." Most lessons, it was claimed, were "Euro-centric, and in that sense racist".. What absurdity and arrogance these sentimentalists and agitators display. When before has it ever been claimed that the curriculum and educational patterns of the native life and culture must be changed to accommodate newcomers, *and* at the public's expense? Should we not expect that if our children decide to settle for good in the United States, say, or Italy, *their* children in turn would consider themselves American or Italian in culture, albeit perhaps with an affectionate remembrance of their forbears? As for that curious term "Euro-centricity", we are a part of Europe and Europe is our culture.

Far more rewarding viewing than anything in Channel Four's obsessively left-wing and miscegenist diet has been B.B.C.2's *All Our Working Lives*. Over a number of weeks it systematically built up a tragic picture of Britain's economic decline, diagnosing for each industry in turn the historical moments at which chances were missed, bad policies espoused by incompetent and time-serving politicians, or good policies neutralised by adverse winds from abroad. One programme dealt with the steel-workers, whose story highlighted the curse of over-manning. In too many places we have, or did have, two men doing one man's job. Changing a claygun nozzle in

one of Britain's steel works traditionally required *eight* men, drawn from three separate unions, to do the work which could have been coped with by two. "I had a mate," recalled an electrician of the 1950s, "and every craftsman had a mate. You think of the number of the craftsmen within the works and then multiply that by two, and that gives you an idea of the excess of labour that existed at that time." Yet the fact that the British Steel Corporation has recognised in recent years the enormity of the problem, and tried to reorganise and modernise itself under conditions which, the imposition in 1981-83 of Mr. Ian Macgregor's international financier's axe apart, have given it at least the possibility of recovery, offers little cause for satisfaction. For precious little attempt has been made by government to provide concrete plans to find alternative employment for the fifty per cent of the steel workforce who have been shed. The story of these unemployed men, as of those who have been rejected from almost every department of the working life of the nation, is unbearably sad. And all the while the treacherous politicians, beholden as they are to alien financial interests, remain wedded to the uncertain system of international trade and wilfully refuse to protect the home market, their plight will remain insufferable.

A row is brewing in the Falklands over the planned immigration of several Vietnamese "boat" families currently living with relations in South Yorkshire. So intense has the issue become within the Islands that the Sheep Owners' Association has sent a circular to all its members condemning the move to permit the Viets to take up residence. Mr. Sydney Miller, on behalf of the S.O.E., underlined their incompatibility when he said, "We simply don't want Vietnamese in the Falklands, especially when we know there are several hundred Britishers wanting to emigrate." How right he is in his stand, particularly when what starts as an immigrant trickle invariably becomes a raging torrent! In what light then would the relatives and loved ones view the sacrifice of the 220-odd men who gave their lives to free the Falklands of aliens only two short years ago?

In a thoroughly objectionable leading article, *The Times* floated the idea that the growing abomination of experiments on human embryos may be acceptable up to six weeks' gestation. One does not need to look far for the inspiration for such a frightful suggestion. It is the widespread acceptance of abortion which has paved the way for this kind of thinking by marking out the unborn as unprotected by whatever few principles of human dignity our

society retains. Where, indeed, is the ethical distinction between the killing of an implanted embryo at 26 weeks and an unimplanted embryo at six weeks? It was dearly to be hoped that the Warnock Committee Report would not permit the fact of rampant abortion to determine the way in which it thought about the protection of human beings in their first days of existence. But that body, in its recommendations to the Secretary of State for Social Services, has given its approval to human vivisection up to fourteen days after fertilisation. Evidently, the idea has gained ground that experimentation on human persons is acceptable "provided suffering is not involved" (a claim that nobody should believe for a moment). Before long, if we are not careful, such experiments will move beyond the bounds of the embryo to better laboratory specimens in the form of anaesthetised children and adults, whether severely handicapped or terminally ill, and the unwanted elderly. This new euthanasia would doubtless bear an *imprimatur* of learned medical men "anxious to further human understanding and medical progress" similar to that increasingly bestowed on embryo

"research". Doesn't it all send a deep chill down the spine?

As for the stuff and nonsense in *The Times* about "Britain's first surrogate mother", more impressive was Canon G. B. Bentley's rejoinder, "Are we asked to believe that never before did the husband of a barren wife get a bastard by another woman in order to continue his line?" Surrogate motherhood is as old as Abraham and Hagar, the only novelty being the substitution of artificial insemination for the real thing. And we would wager most men rate that as being *far* from an improvement!

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K.	£4.00
Overseas airmail	£4.50
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	\$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

SPOTLIGHT ON CASTRO

According to a report in the West German newspaper *National Zeitung*, dated March 16th, 1984, Fidel Castro, the Cuban Communist dictator, is of Jewish extraction. The German nationalist 'paper is standing on sure ground, for it takes as the source of its report none other than an Israeli evening newspaper, *Ma'ariv*, which reported Castro's Jewish origin in 1978.

The report states that Fidel Castro Ruz was born in the year 1927 as the son of a well-to-do landowner. In his younger days in Cuba he met the former Ambassador to Israel, Ricardo Subirana I-Lobo, alias Richard Wolf. Wolf was a functionary in the Weimar Republic, the report goes on to state, emigrating to Cuba at the start of the Third Reich. In Cuba, Wolf became a millionaire where he met Castro in the early days before the 'revolution'. The two quickly became bosom friends, each one admitting to the other his Jewish background: "Ich bin Jude". Lobo, alias Wolf, eventually became a Cuban diplomat to Rome, Peking and last, before Castro's takeover of Cuba, Ambassador to Israel. Since then, Lobo has remained as a private resident in Tel Aviv.

Subversive Activities

The *National Zeitung* further states that Castro trained as a lawyer before entering politics in 1952. A year later he was jailed for subversive activities

against President Batista. However, by 1956 he was released, his fifteen year sentence having been cut drastically. Castro fled to Mexico where, with some international help, he recruited a revolutionary force with which he returned to Cuba and seized power. Thousands fled the country and those opponents who remained were shot. The report goes on to say that Castro quickly set up a state run along Soviet lines, though some of his more ambitious plans were curtailed by President Kennedy.

The newspaper states that beginning in the early 'seventies, Castro went about his Communist activities with great gusto and brutality, involving his troops in places as far apart as Angola and Vietnam, all with full Soviet support. The *National Zeitung's* report showed a photograph of Castro with the East German Red boss, Erich Honecker, but his real employer is the Soviet Union, upon which Cuba is dependent for its financial survival. Since the Rockefeller Chase Bank occupies a prominent place in Moscow, one can only wonder what connection Castro retains with the financial wolves of Wall Street. At any rate, we can be certain that Castro's is another name to add to the long list of Jewish revolutionary leaders.

RICHARD VAN DE-BRUK.

THE BISHOP CHALLENGES GOVERNMENT ECONOMICS

by A. M. WADE

On B.B.C. T.V., on April 17th, 1984, the Rt. Rev. David Sheppard gave the Richard Dimbleby annual lecture before an invited audience at the Royal Society of Arts in London. In it he called upon the Church, state and individuals to arrest the increasing poverty and unemployment in Britain's inner city areas. The Bishop affirmed that *there can be an alternative policy* — "in fact, there are several".

It is a most regrettable fact that pillars of the Establishment are united in upholding the present system and turning a blind eye to the possibility of a viable alternative. If such an alternative exists, we are not intended to find it, for we have been solemnly assured by all the acknowledged experts that there is *no alternative* and all other suggestions would lead again to hyper-inflation and loss of employment.

Providentially there have been at least two professions in which a degree of independence of thought has been considered a right implanted in the mind and soul of man by the Creator. Two lines of thought have converged to believe in the simple proposition that a nation which possesses all the physical and human properties and resources with which to construct new homes and public works could be organised to do so without being impeded by the objection that there is no money available for the work.

Let all who will believe that Corner Shop economics must determine national policy, but there are those in the Church and outside the Church who believe that human considerations must be accorded priority over narrowly conceived rules of economics which even then, in their entirety, are avoided and denied.

The alleged need to curtail expenditure is to keep borrowing requirements down to a limit, but what is overlooked, but mentioned clearly in the textbooks on Economics, is that an alternative exists, viz. the power of the State to issue or create that additional money. Such a practice would, in fact, be highly preferable to the nation because it would eliminate the otherwise increased national debt and the consequent increase in debt interest charges. If there were no inhibitions on the free expression of opinion, leaders of the Church and Engineers would find no difficulty in asserting it to be a natural law that *what is physically possible and socially desirable can be made financially possible*. Money was devised to assist in the organisation of life, but it has no inherent value and is in no way a vital necessity.

Why, then, are the demands of monetary policy so

out of step with the physical realities of life? One might reasonably suppose that Parliament, after its many years of operation and its massive expertise, would have perfected the monetary system so that all national resources could be used to the best purpose, both for the present generation and all following. But this would be taking too naive a view of human nature and expecting too high a standard of consensus in legislative circles.

Deeply Rooted System

The monetary system under which our nation operates is nearly three hundred years old and therefore deeply rooted here, and in the U.S.A. to which it spread.

The beneficiaries of this system have no immediate need to change it and have every reason to feel pleased with its results. What may cause a change of attitude is the possible collapse of the international financial system.

The system was never sound from a national point of view because it was not based on the principle of service to the nation as a whole, but on a concealed principle of exploitation of society by securing a monopoly of the issue of money, beginning with paper ostensibly convertible, but not really so, then proceeding to bank credit with no physical entity, but nevertheless nearly all the significance of legal tender.

By all established legal codes the issue of money is the sole prerogative of the State, for self-evident reasons. Nevertheless, the reverse has become standard practice through the mechanism of cheque-book accountancy. Prior to this development, during the middle of the last century, banks had been allowed to print notes under fairly loose controls; hence they had been allowed to create a certain amount of money, thereby enjoying a unique privilege. The government of the time saw the mistake and decided to impose new restrictions and passed the legislation accordingly. But the banks circumvented the intentions of the Act by the cheque system, and opened a door on the virtual creation of money by means of credit advances without tight control by the State. True, the Bank of England exercised some control through controlling the cash base, but about 85 per cent of the money supply consisted of bank credit lent out to the public and private sectors, largely outside Parliamentary control, and placing the Government and people in the false position of debtor to a privately owned banking

system, which had by now acquired the position of sole creator of national finance.

The whole object of State, or Crown, monopoly of the creation of money was to preserve its integrity and value. Counterfeiting of cash or later, of notes, was regarded as a serious crime. The right of issue was a prerogative of sovereignty, and the only way to safeguard the honesty and credibility of the unit of money and to prevent robbery of the public by illegal inflation of spurious currency. What, then, can be said of the present-day system of not only denying the State the creation of its own money supply, but making it dependent on a privately-owned banking system for all its monetary requirements. Even the currency notes come into circulation as debt to the banking system. If we are rightly condemned to tolerate such an inverted system of finance, no wonder we are in debt to the extent of some £2,000 per head and unable to escape it increasing under the rules of the money game.

This system is inescapable under the rules which this Government and Establishment generally wish us to accept as a fact of Sound Money, of Sound Economics, of commonsense, and fact of life, but monetary reformers reject that thesis lock, stock and barrel for reasons already given, and more to follow. This is not a condemnation of the banking system itself, which is superbly run by men of the highest integrity, efficiency and courtesy, and performs an absolutely essential service in the nation and between nations, and interference by governments is not suggested, but one fundamental change is called for. The supreme power, resident in the function of creation of the money supply, should return to the State. The fractional reserve should be raised to 100 per cent, in other words.

Deep Resentment

In view of this inherited situation, one must not be surprised at reluctance to examine banking practices critically by Members of Parliament and the Press, because the arms of the system are very long.

At the time of writing, the draconian type of Treasury policy on the nation is creating deep resentment among worthy sections of the people. Nurses, not given to mercenary complaints, suffer great indignities by reasons of shortage of accommodation and its inadequate provisions; railwaymen are under pressure to run trains without a guard to save money; miners are no longer treated with respect for the difficult and dangerous work they do, and short term policy is prepared to close mines which our children may need. Great national assets are being sold off in order to reduce the Public

Sector Borrowing Requirement — surely a bit of slick financial manoeuvring. V.A.T. is loaded onto building works which are designed to improve living accommodation. Cities are being squeezed when their needs for more money are on account of factors outside their control. We are told the compression of the Department of Health and Social Security is really necessary. *Is it necessary? Is Government policy demanded by immutable laws of economics?* We rail about Russia telling their people lies! Why, then, cannot answers be given to serious and simple questions about the money system, to prove that the present policy is necessary? This Scroogian, mean, insensitive policy, generally known as Monetarism, is in fashion in the U.S.A., but there is considerable and rising opposition to it there and here.

The following extract is from *Money — The Master Key* by John H. Blackmore, a Member of the Canadian Parliament during the inter-war years:

"Many folks do not know that England had no national debt until the Bank of England was formed in 1694 under William Paterson. This is a most arresting truth. Britain fought wars before that event, too! Yet she incurred no perpetuated national debt.

"Contrast with that happy debt-free condition what has occurred since the Bank of England came. Christopher Hollis in *The Breakdown of Money* recalls to us that the Great War, 1914-1918, added to Britain's debt £7,000 million. Of that amount, £1,000 million was borrowed from the U.S.A., £2,000 million was collected from the British public, and the other £4,000 million — where did it come from? From British banks it came, most of it. They created it, in the form of Bank Credit. This they were able to do because of the producing and consuming power of the British people. It therefore belonged to those people. Yet the banks claimed it and hung it about the necks of the citizens to be borne with interest by them and their posterity to the last generation. *Must nations thus for ever carry the burdens of not only the present but past and future wars? If so, what will the end be?* [emphasis added]. One cause of the debt, we see, is the way we finance wars.

"Another cause of debt is the way we get the money we use. Every dollar you and I ever possessed was borrowed from a bank or out of someone's private holdings. It was and is, therefore, a debt, and is accumulating interest."

The monetary system was also questioned in New Zealand in 1955 when a Royal Commission on Banking, Credit and Currency was held. Dr. O. C. Mazengarb, Q.C., explained in his address that the investigation had not been as complete as desired:

"The whole process of money creation is steeped in delusion. It has been permitted only because so

many people (including legislators and bankers) did not realise what the banks were doing. They realise it now, and if banks are permitted to go on creating money in this way after the unequivocal admissions made by the Chairman of the Associated Banks, and by the eminent Counsel who represented them, it is only because the electors have not yet had the opportunity of registering their opinion on the matter.

"Is there any responsible person who, in his heart of hearts, honestly and sincerely believes that private banks should be permitted to create money? This Commission has had the evidence of the high-ranking English economist, Colin Clark, and other witnesses in support of the view that the issuance of all money should be the prerogative of the State.

"No positive statement of law has been produced to the Commission that private banks actually have the right to create money. Nowhere in legal literature can the statement be found that the banks have authority to issue any part of the nation's money supply. If there were such a statement, Sir Wilfred Sim, and Mr. Whyte, on behalf of the Trading Banks, or Mr. Fussell, on behalf of the Reserve Bank, would surely have produced it.

"There is no law on our statute book, no legal case law purporting to confer on the Trading Banks the right to create and issue money."

In view of this unequivocal evidence that the State should create and issue the national money supply, and that banks have no authority to create money, why does the Government refuse to exercise its prerogative and avoid the unnecessary cost of borrowing? How can our present practice be regarded as financial rectitude?

In the light of the above revelations, the Bishop would appear very much in the right. But these facts have been known to those who have taken a serious interest in affairs for many years. In 1931 the distinguished electrical engineer and business man, Arthur Kitson, father of the monetary reform movement, published a pamphlet addressed to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales on the world crisis of that time. A short quotation from this follows:

"All through the present period of trade depression, the Banks have flourished beyond that of any previous time, and at the expense of the wealth of the producers. It is notorious that during the past ten years — whilst our industries have been stagnating — the Banks have made the greatest profits in their history! Surely a financial system that can flourish on the ruins of industry is a menace to the welfare of any country.

"One has evidence of the prosperity of the Banks by the hundreds of palatial buildings that have been erected on the most desirable and most expensive sites in our towns and cities since the War! And this at a time when hundreds of factories and scores of mines have been closing down and thousands of firms abandoned or bankrupt. No nation can prosper if its chief business is merely money-lending! Money-lenders create no wealth. They live on the taxation of the wealth-producers, and all through the ages they have been regarded as a menace to civilisation! The true source of a nation's wealth and power is Industry and Trade. Banking is merely a convenience."

How true all this is over again, in exaggerated proportions.

Lord Melchett's Indictment

The Rt. Hon. Lord Melchett (1868-1930) was a barrister and experienced business executive and politician and first Chairman of I.C.I. Ltd. Although he must have been under very great pressure on account of his heavy commercial responsibilities, he must have dedicated his last few months of life to formulating his views on the economic system of our land, with the object of saving our country from a further disaster of war and depression. His book, *Modern Money*, is a mine of information and advice on the possible reforms which he considered essential and pressing. It is almost needless to add that this book was apparently ignored by the Establishment and, tragically, he did not live to defend his ideas.

The following quotation displays the crass culpability of succeeding generations who have plunged our nation into unnecessary debt and industrial despair. Our leaders must either be under duress or the inability to think and act objectively. As previously mentioned, there has been placed by some authority a veto on frank discussion of the money system, so that the many thoughts on present day social problems have been tangential, leaving the crux of the question untouched, and discussions abortive.

"Whatever the purpose of life, it is particularly foolish for its progress and advancement to be constantly delayed by what we arrange to call money, or to write down as money in books, to please or deceive ourselves. Real wealth consists, as I have said in another book, of the power which man possesses over the natural forces and substances by which he is surrounded. He may choose to represent their power in one way or another, but these methods should be his servants. Today, they are our masters. There is no economist, no banker, no financier, who can give clear answers to the questions put by a distressed and tormented world. The whole of this

subject, upon which our very existence depends, is full of doubt and controversy and always has been. I believe that in time a clearer appreciation of the facts of the world will lead to complete understanding of the problems and to the adoption of simple methods to handle what should be a simple proposition . . .

"It is not their job [the bankers'] directly to settle and fix the economic system of the country, nor, lacking industrial experience, are they best suited to do it. For it is upon industry, not upon banking, that England has grown great. England's banks have grown because the industrialists of England have employed her natural resources and her population to make her a great and prosperous community . . .

"We can create all the currency and all the credit

that we need for our development upon a three per cent per annum increase basis."

There is the support of Lord Melchett for the proposition contended for in this article. This is the key to self-liquidating national finance which is being urged on the Treasury from several quarters without any rational reply forthcoming to date, so far as is known.

It would seem no exaggeration to say that the whole integrity of Treasury finance hinges on this precise question of how future P.S.B.R. additions to the money supply are obtained — by the valid and preferable course of State creation of credit or subservience to banking vested interests at the expense of the people, by borrowing bank credit yet again, which costs practically nothing to create?

A PROVEN HOLOCAUST

Concerning the "Holocaust", which may or may not have happened, depending entirely upon which of the evidences you choose to believe, in which six million Jews were supposed to have been burned alive, I neither believe nor disbelieve anything I hear, and only half of what I am supposed to see.

I have never said that it could not have happened, if of course there were that many Jews in Europe, or in the entire world at that time. But from all the evidence in support of the claims, and the evidence against the possibility of it having happened at all, I am convinced that it could not have happened in Germany or in Poland. But it could very well have happened in Russia under Stalin's insane tyranny.

But while we are on the subject of Holocausts, arguing back and forth about whether or not it did happen, and planning to build a Memorial in our nation's capital to commemorate this event, we are closing our eyes to a much greater Holocaust that has been occurring within this nation for some time — and the number of innocent victims of this proven Holocaust is much greater than six million, as the figures will prove.

I am referring to the number of innocent children that are being burned to death every day by a Saline injection, before they have had a chance to be born, because Abortion is murder, and the Saline Solution used to murder them is a means of burning them to death from the inside out, is it not?

— Delamer Duverus, in *American Sunbeam*.

BOOKS NEEDED FOR A.K. CHESTERTON ACADEMY

Please help us with this project.

We need books on issues of interest and importance to nationalists. We need magazines, pamphlets, bulletins, leaflets, even scrapbooks, dealing with British patriotic organisations from 1918 to the present day.

If you have any appropriate material you would like to donate or sell to the Candour Library, please write to Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.

Whatever you do, DON'T throw it all away!

For your next Fun Run, Marathon, Demi or Charitable Hop, join Candour Careerers by wearing one of our distinctive tee-shirts and by naming the Candour Trust for sponsorship. Write to Box B, Candour Publishing Co.

BUY AND DISTRIBUTE COMMON MARKET SUICIDE

A. K. Chesterton's exposure of the threat posed to the integrity and unity of this country by membership of the E.E.C.

5 for £2, 10 for £3.50 from

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

THE DEVILRY OF "ONE MAN, ONE VOTE"

by NOEL HUNT

A recent article in the *Sunday Telegraph* asked: "Just how odious is apartheid?", and made the suggestion that the South African Government, "having declared the blacks all to be foreigners — citizens of the homelands — it would now be possible to accept a quota of new black citizens without having to fear flooding".

It is perhaps worth making the point first that in South Africa the blacks are foreigners in fact and not merely by definition. When the Dutch occupied the Cape in 1652 there were no Negroes in the area. There were a few Bushmen, but they were Khoisan by race, not Negroid. It was not until the 1800s that the blacks migrating south met the north-bound whites.

The *Telegraph* article asks, apparently reasonably enough, "Why not allow them [the blacks] to have the same possibility of applying for South African citizenship as do foreign whites?" The thinking here is that common to most of the West today. It holds that once a black has been seated — no matter how briefly — on a school bench and there "educated" — no matter how little or for what — there will from then on always be in that black a middle-class *Guardian*-reading white liberal seeking to get out. This is nonsense, of course: inside that black there is and will continue to be a black. He is not fighting to get out. He likes it there, and very sensibly too, and is going to stay there. Contrary to liberal belief, if you send a black to Harrow you do not end up with a white man who happens to have a black skin. What you get, in fact, is a black man who happens to have had an English public school education. You also find yourself with someone who is far more difficult to deal with politically than his tribal brothers. This is because he has learned the moral and philosophical bases of our civilisation and the way in which our minds work. He can thus use arguments based on our mental and moral predispositions, which he either despises or cannot understand, to attain an end based firmly on his own racial beliefs.

However, the strongest arguments against the acceptance of a quota of suitable blacks on to the electoral rolls is that it would not work. It is quite possible that the South African whites would accept such a proposition. They have just been lunatic enough to accept constitutional proposals which will in time lose them their country. It is certain, though, that such a proposal would not satisfy the blacks

or those who manipulate them. The reason for such certainty is that such an attempt has already been made and that it failed. The attempt was made in the former Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. It was rejected by the blacks, not by the whites.

Federal Electoral System

It will be recalled that, bemused by egalitarian theory and ignoring their daily experience of Africans, the whites agreed to a non-racial electoral system based on education and earning capacity as qualifications for the franchise. The Federal electoral system was thus a very civilised one. It was an attempt to get away from the idiocy of universal suffrage and to base the possession of a vote not on a head but on what it contained. The system was "sold" by the politicians to the whites of the Federation as a "meritocracy". Merit, defined as the possession of certain educational qualifications and proof of the ability to earn a certain sum every year, admitted anyone of any race to the electoral roll. The system, which held that the possession of a vote was a real privilege and so had to be earned, was probably the most civilised and sophisticated in the world. It remained unrivalled until the Rhodesians evolved a similarly non-racial voting system just before the white surrender.

One would have thought that such a civilised system and one which attached such a high value to the vote would have been hailed with joy throughout the world. In fact, it will be remembered that there was universal condemnation of the Federation by politicians and men of good will everywhere because the system was not one of universal suffrage.

The concept of a meritocracy was decisively rejected by the blacks of the Federation. It is not too much to say that it was the word "merit" which was at least as fatal to the Federation as the duplicity of the British government. Of course, the black could hardly object publicly to the concept of advancement on merit. If he did so, he admitted that he was afraid of the white in fair competition. Yet the black, though not in general particularly clever, is yet extremely astute. He knew that in a society where merit, as defined in Western terms, was to be the touchstone he would always be low man on the totem pole. Yet to admit that he was not equal to the white man in any way at all would invalidate his claim for advancement and eventual rule. He and his advisers solved this problem by screaming for "democracy", by which he and they meant universal

suffrage. In his heart the black had as complete a contempt for "democracy" as did Plato, but in no other way could he come to black government. He had, therefore, to reject the Federal (and white) concept of "merit" and struggle to attain "democracy", by which he meant mob rule or ochlocracy. With the help of Britain and America he succeeded — and chaos and starvation replaced order and plenty.

Ultimate Purpose

The South African blacks do not wish to share power. They wish to have it all, and fully intend to. For this reason they can only accept "one man, one vote". Only in this way can they destroy the white man. That is their ultimate purpose and the purpose of those who manipulate them. One cannot placate the implacable, so all attempts to share power with the blacks are doomed to failure. They cannot be assimilated: they can only be ruled.

Albert Schweitzer, a friend of the black man if ever he had one, had this to say: "They [Africans] have neither the intellectual, mental nor emotional abilities to equate or share equally with white men in any of the functions of our civilisation. I have given them my life to try to bring them to the advantages which our civilisation must offer, but I have become well aware that we must retain this status: white the superior and they the inferior. For whenever a white man seeks to live among them as their equal, they will either destroy him or devour him, and they will destroy all of his work. And so, for any existing relationship, or for any benefit of these people, let white men from anywhere in the world who would come to help Africa remember that you must continually maintain this status — you the master and they the inferior, like children that you would help or teach. Never fraternise with them as equals. Never accept them as your equal socially or they will devour you. They will destroy you."

It will be recalled that as soon as Schweitzer had uttered this salutary but unpopular truth, from being the darling of the liberal left he became in one day a non-person, never again mentioned. This does not mean that what he said was not true, because it was and is; it merely means that liberals shy away from such brutal truths and use their control of the media to ensure that the speaker shall never offend again.

Once the white man has been eliminated in South Africa the blacks can get down to the bloody and congenial task of settling which tribe shall rule. If anyone doubts this, let him look at what is happening today in Zimbabwe, and what happened in Nigeria and the Congo once the white man had been mad enough to hand over control. That this is what

the future holds for South Africa is clear from this extract from the published *Programme of Action* of the Organisation of African Unity: "We cannot compromise with any white government, extreme or liberal, or agree to multi-racial nonsense. We are determined to destroy all traces of white civilisation. The rivers of the South are to run red with the blood of the white tyrants and their children."

Why on earth, then, should the Negro settle for a "quota of new black citizens?"

AFRICA'S MONO-RACIALISM

"It is my belief, repeatedly stressed in *Candour*, that multi-racialism leads inevitably to African mono-racialism, and for examples of what that would be like we must glance at what happened in Angola, the Congo and Kikuyuland. If the days of White domination are over, then — since partnership is a mirage — the days of African domination (subject only to foreign financial controls) must be about to dawn."

— A. K. Chesterton, October 27, 1961.

A.K. IN SOUTH AFRICA

A C120 cassette tape of A. K. Chesterton in Cape Province in 1964 addressing the Candour League of South Africa on "The Survival of the White Races".

PRICE £4 (OVERSEAS £6)

Candour Publishing Company,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

Books on a wide variety of topics of interest to Nationalists are now available from the BNP Book Service. If the book you want is not in stock, we can order it for you. Send an s.a.e. for our catalogue to: Mr. Malcolm Skeggs, BNP Books, P.O. Box 446, oLndon SE23 2LS.

THE ATTRIBUTION OF WAR GUILT

by OLIVER GILBERT

It was always my hope that one day we should have a second spate of war crimes trials, only this time not the kind of travesty of justice inflicted at Nuremberg by the leaders of a victorious war, when the losers were illegally murdered.

We should have seen arraigned first of all the "bloody baboons of Russia", to use one of Churchill's phrases. Their charge? The slaughter of 15,000 Polish officers. These were the major part of the men taken prisoner by the Soviet army, the rest of the Polish officers captured having been subjected to intense brain-washing and, in order to obtain food, pretended in the majority of cases to accept the Communist indoctrination. The unconvertible remainder suffered the usual fate of brave men held by a savage foe. The crime was blamed immediately on the Germans and our obliging press obeyed the Government orders to give the charge the utmost publicity. At the macabre drama at Nuremberg, it was the Soviet prosecutors who had the colossal audacity to accuse the major German "war-criminals" with this deed, which had gone against all the accepted customs of warfare.

The German leaders were charged with the murder of 15,000 Polish officers in Katyn Forest. Faked evidence was produced and the only defence witness they were allowed — Dr. Francois Naville, Professor of Forensic Medicine at Geneva University — was not permitted, in the end, to give his evidence, although he lived only a short distance away. Although the Russians' charges were so patently spurious, the other judges still wanted the world to believe the Germans were responsible.

Then, perhaps, we should have seen in the dock the men responsible for the ruthless and sadistic bombing of the defenceless old city of Dresden. Air Marshal Harris, in his book *Bomber Offensive*, describes how, on the orders of Churchill, two thousand heavy bombing planes obliterated Dresden on the night of February 13th, 1945. High explosive and phosphorous bombs were rained on many thousands of refugees, mainly women and children, who were fleeing before the advancing mongol hordes of the Red Army. By that time, the war had long since ceased to be an imperative military operation. Rather, it was the final breaking of the desperate resistance of a defeated nation. Harris wrote, "I will only say that the attack on Dresden was at the time considered a military necessity by much more important people than myself." He meant, of course, Churchill, Roosevelt and the

political-appointee General Eisenhower, who was once described by General MacArthur as "a man not fit to command a battalion."

Eisenhower, incidentally, vetoed Montgomery's plan for an attack through central Europe because that would have restrained the Soviet armies in their drive for masterdom over the bulk of the European land-mass. He was acting on the instructions of the international bankers of Wall Street, for whose benefit we had initiated the last war. They, the backers of Communism, wanted the Russian hordes to advance as far as possible into the heart of Europe in order that Germany should never rise again as a menace to international capitalism.

Horrific Weapon

Then I believe we should have put on trial the men responsible for the ultimate crime of dropping the atomic bomb on Hiroshima in 1945, whereby 70,000 people were liquidated. I hold no brief for the Japanese: I don't like them, especially since three of my friends were captured by them and have since died as a result of their treatment while in enemy hands. That said, we were not told at the time that Japan was suing for surrender terms. The war lords, however, spurned their offer to capitulate for they wanted to try out the destructive effects of their latest horrific weapon. Like the slaughter of Dresden, it fulfilled no military purpose, serving only to impress upon the losers the great might of the merciless victors. Japanese people are still dying from the effects of that dastardly crime.

The next on the long list should have been a certain captain of my regiment who ordered his men to machine-gun a group of German prisoners during the advance in France. When questioned by the Colonel, he said, "If I had sent them to the rear, it would have held up our successful attack, which I considered more important than the lives of a few Huns." He was not court-martialled and after the war was promoted to Brigadier. To their credit, five of his men refused to obey his orders.

Then I should have liked to see charged with war crimes the jailers of the German leaders, who inflicted upon them every possible degradation that their warped minds could conceive, including kicking them in their vital places to ensure that if they were not hanged, they would not be able to father any more children. Not only Germans were cruelly treated. When he surrendered to American troops in Italy, Ezra Pound had not set foot in America for

years, and he claimed he was not an American subject. He was accused of broadcasting from Rome, but whether he was guilty or not will never be known. In 1946 a jury in the U.S.A. found him insane and unfit to plead. This was after he was kept for months in solitary confinement without clothing inside a specially built barbed wire compound with a concrete floor, with no shelter and no bed. By day he was exposed to broiling sun; by night he was under the glare of spotlights.

But it is the Russians who were by far the worst war criminals. The best comment I have read about them is from the writings of Amiel, who stated in 1856, "The harsh gifts of fate have left their stamp on the race of the Muscovites. A certain sombre obstinacy, which under the sway of circumstances becomes implacable and even ruthless, a coldly indomitable force, with a sort of primitive ferocity, a background of savage harshness, that would rather wreck the world than yield, the indestructible instinct of the barbarian horde still persisting in a half-civilised nation . . . What terrible masters the Russians would be if ever they should spread the might of their rule over the southern countries! A polar despotism, a tyranny such as the world has not yet known, silent as the darkness, keen as ice, unfeeling as bronze, slavery without compensation or relief." These are the people with whom we fought a war for "freedom" and "civilisation"!

Editor's note — The recent obituary in *The Times* of Marshal of the R.A.F. Sir Arthur Harris informed us that his policy was that "if bombers could guarantee to hit no target smaller than a whole city, then a whole city that target must be . . . to destroy the will of the German people, to make them homeless" For Dresden, this meant that its packed citizens, its refugees, even its zoo animals were, in February 1945, incinerated, buried alive or boiled to death in the horrific fire storm created by two waves of Lancaster bombers, numbering about 770, and followed the next day by over 300 U.S. Flying Fortresses to bomb and burn up the survivors. Whether the death toll was nearer 30,000 or 300,000, and figures wildly vary as to that brutal and degrading attack, this deliberate onslaught against civilians was as much a war crime as any atrocity perpetrated by the Nazis. *The Observer* commented that although critics saddled Harris with the responsibility, it was Churchill who ordered the massive blow to help the Russians, and the Air Minister, Sir Archibald Sinclair, authorised the raid. As Oliver Gilbert's article implies, only the fact that they were on the victorious side has prevented them from being ranked with the likes of Goring or Hess.

Read David Irving's *The Destruction Of Dresden* for the horrifying story of one of the most devastating and controversial episodes of the Second World War. Only £1.50, including postage, from Candour Publishing Co.

THE TRUTH BEHIND THE PASSPORTS ROW

The British press reported the French Government's decision to make passports obligatory for British visitors from July 8th, but without stating the real reason. A French friend has just sent me a photo-copy of a *France-Soir* article that bluntly explains why this action has been taken.

"This decision has the aim of putting a stop to the clandestine immigration into France of Indians, Africans and Asiatics from the former British Empire territories and who now live in Great Britain." It goes on to state that France has several times asked the British authorities to introduce proper identity cards, or tourist cards delivered by the authorities instead of by travel agents, but Britain has always refused.

My French friend founded and ran for many years a newsletter called *Europe Notre Patrie* especially devoted to pointing out the dangers of mass immigration. In her letter to me, she remarks: "Indeed, a whole district of Paris, the 13me. Arrondissement,

where, ten years ago, one practically never saw a Chinese, is now crowded with Chinese from Hong Kong."

She asked me why they had left Britain for France. I could not give a reason, but suggested that (a) simply they could make more money in Paris, or (b) they had not settled in Britain, but are waiting for the moment when all the "Hong Kong Chinese" will be admitted to Britain as "refugees from the coming Communist regime." I wonder what the explanation really is. Personally, I have yet to meet a Chinese in Britain who was not "from Hong Kong".

SYLVIA OUSTON.

OBITUARY

It is with great sadness that we have been informed of the death of R. L. J. Miln, of Perth, Scotland, who was a very active and interested reader of *Candour* right up to his death. Our sincerest condolences are extended to Mrs. Miln.

ENGLISH SAGA

by Peter Hill

As schoolboys many years ago
We'd play the latest game:
Monopoly — which gripped us so,
It well deserved its name.
The boys who gained most 'real estate'
Were loth to leave the board,
And to those losing would donate
A pittance from their hoard.
Accepting charity had brought
A painful sense of shame
To losers, so the winners bought
More money for the game.
To any who had overspent
Small loans would be advanced;
Most of the funny money went
To winners, as it chanced.
The poorest still were in a mess:
Inflation was so bad
That all their income bought much less —
And loans cost all they had.
The extra circulating cash
Oiled every wheel, and made
Huge profits for the rich and rash.
Even the railways paid!

* * *

Monopoly, after the war
The only game in town
Made its appeal to more and more,
And industry ran down.
The manufacturers that seemed
Equipped for foreign fray
Were by the asset-strippers deemed
Their easy, lawful prey.
And those who gain the real estate
Are loth to leave the Board;
At meetings which they dominate
Shareholders are ignored.
The big monopolistic firms
Possess their plenteous plunder;
The small ones have to come to terms
With bankers — or go under —
Paying six times the interest rate
That German banks impose
On small firms they would stimulate;
So British small firms close.
Professionals of every hue
Monopolize, by right;
You have to let them work for you —
Or face a legal fight.
The City or the Arab buys

The forest and the farm;
We know they only privatize,
And that can mean no harm.
We send out money to finance
The sweat-shops in Hong Kong;
But soon it ends — the long romance
With Britain's Suzie Wong.
And every pension fund invests
Some money in Japan,
Protesting long-term interests
Of Britain's working man.
We've sold the jobs, we've sold the plant,
To countries far away,
Because it's evident we can't
Work here and make it pay.
With every sport a business now,
And going on the air,
Each likely lad is seeing how
To be a millionaire.
In industry he sees small scope
For learning any trade:
The Closed Shop Act has dashed all hope —
The unions have it made.
The daughter of the working man
Is earning more, by far —
She prances naked with a fan
Or topless, in a bar.
The newspapers — the Fourth Estate —
Are sold to foreign buyers,
And editors they denigrate
Replaced by venal liars.
The market, which was always praised
For keeping prices low
Is flouted, and the gas price raised
As high as gas can go.
Monopoly in telephones
Is different, perhaps;
They tell us in engaging tones
They can't control the taps.
The market pulls out every stop
To make you a rash spender,
And every other High Street shop
Is now a money-lender.
'It matters not who makes the laws,'
Old Mayer Rothschild said:
'More power will be mine, because
I have the banks instead.'
Although our Queen is always seen
As ruling everything,
Without a doubt you'll soon find out
Monopoly is King!